LABOUR MONTHLY

1s.

EDITOR . R PALME DUTT

End the Cold War Henry Wallace
(U.S.A. Presidential Candidate)

Summer Lightning R.P.D.

Germany - The Storm Centre
J. Winternitz

Industrial Battlefront George Allison

AUGUST, 1948

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXX. No. 8

CONTENTS

August, 1948

	Page
Notes of the Month: *Summer Lightning* by R. P. D. ...	225
End the Cold War by HENRY WALLACE	233
Germany—The Storm Centre by J. WINTERNITZ ...	236
Spain by LON ELLIOTT	241
Industrial Battlefront by GEORGE ALLISON	245
100 Years Ago—	
Marx on the Class Struggle in Britain	248
Document of the Month—	
Situation in Germany and Berlin: Soviet reply ...	251
Book Review—	
The 1848 Manifesto Mishandled: *Andrew Rothstein* ...	254

WHERE PRAISE IS DUE

"PLEASE praise the fine initiative of your readers", an anti-fascist journalist wrote us from Berlin. "My hearty thanks to that volunteer whose copy I get. It is so useful in our work", writes another of the same trade in Hamburg. "It will be a very great help for me indeed, as it is really very difficult to get any printed matter of this kind here", remarks yet another from Berlin. Praise where praise is due; and we are delighted to pass it on to those British readers who undertook to send their copies to Germany with which—because of the lack of the peace treaty—normal trading still does not exist. Progressive Germans, keen for news and views from other countries, cannot send money out to pay for foreign publications. And until we have played our part in ensuring a just and democratic peace treaty, a duty rests on us all to remember these needs, not least for those in the British Zone, where "there is such a lack of progressive papers", as another writes from Schwelm. Only a day or so ago, a well-known English journalist, recently returned from Germany, who himself has taken out subscriptions for colleagues there, told me just how true was this picture. "I could give you a list as long as your arm of German democrats who could use every copy your readers could spare", he said.

Talking to him and reading their letters, one got a glimpse of what it means to lack the most essential tools of all for reconstruction. Progressive journals and books are indeed needed by German democrats if they are to build a Germany where at last they can make the words of Eisler's "Song of the Peat Bog Soldiers" come true—the song they sang in the Belsens and Auschwitzes:

"But for us there is no complaining,
Winter one day will be past,
One day we will cry rejoicing
Homeland dear, you're mine at last".

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

Summer Lightning

WARS and threats of war flare out across this uneasy third summer since the armistice. In Germany the Western Powers have landed themselves in an untenable position; they are endeavouring to cover up their discomfiture by bellicose speeches and threatening Notes; the hotheads clamour for immediate war. The British Deputy Chief of Air Staff, Sir Hugh Walmsley, declares that "we have got to get the Air Force cracking, and cracking pretty quickly, to stop our potential enemy, Soviet Russia" (with whom the British-Soviet Treaty of Alliance still exists on paper, and Bevin is no doubt still ready to extend it for fifty years to prove his pacific disposition). In Palestine aggressive war is renewed through Britain's subsidised puppets with British arms and officers against the Jewish State and the United Nations decision, while the Anglo-American conflict and bargaining endeavours to hammer out a reactionary settlement against the freedom of the peoples of the Middle East. To the wars of Western imperialist aggression in Greece, Indo-China and China is now added the full-scale military offensive by land, sea and air against the freedom struggle of the Malayan people, alongside the military offensive against the Burmese people. With greedy eyes the Western imperialists watch the situation in Jugoslavia and hope for a rift in the front of the People's Democracies and the Soviet Union. There is plenty of tension and plenty of inflammable material in the present world situation. Nevertheless, the imperialists are in a far weaker position than they care to confess.

Which Way Germany?

In Germany the Berlin crisis is only the reflection of the real problem of Germany as a whole. Shall Germany be partitioned to establish a reactionary West German State under American control as a vassal-partner of the American-controlled Western Bloc? This is the policy of the London Six Power Conference, which has thrown overboard every pledge and agreement of the Allies at the end of the war. It represents the return to an old vomit, the revival of the old damned and discredited policy of the Dawes Plan, Locarno, support of Hitler and Munich, which brought on the second world war. As Sumner Welles, Roosevelt's Under-Secretary of State during the critical years 1937-1943, has written of the London decisions:

> The fatal delusions that governed the policy of Britain and the United States towards Germany in the nineteen-twenties are once more dominant. We are losing sight of our future security.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The only alternative is that a united democratic Germany be established, purged of fascism and militarism, in accordance with the pledges and agreements of the Allies at the end of the war. This is the policy demanded by the Warsaw Eight Power Conference, which proposes nothing new, but only the honouring of the agreements reached between the Allies during the war. On this basis agreement could be reached between the Powers tomorrow, and the whole crisis could be overcome. The fateful choice between these two policies not only involves the future of democracy or fascism in Germany, with all that that means for Europe. It involves the future of peace or war in Europe. Once again the question of Germany is the pivotal question of Europe and the world situation.

A Bankrupt Policy

But we are no longer in the nineteen twenties or the nineteen thirties. The bankruptcy of the policy of setting up a West German State is becoming exposed before the West German State is constituted. Even the reactionary Premiers summoned to Coblenz (appropriate shrine of counter-revolutionary quislings) to receive their orders, have revealed their reluctance to appear in public as the puppet sponsors of the partition of Germany for the benefit of American monopoly capital. Fifteen million German citizens signed the petition of the German People's Congress for a referendum for German unity. And the Berlin crisis, which appears to have taken the Western conspirators by surprise, has laid bare the impasse to which they have brought themselves. In vain the Western conspirators seek to invoke in impassioned speeches and diplomatic Notes their "legal" right to participate in Four Power control of Berlin. They have driven a coach and four through every agreement for Four Power control of Germany by their unilateral decisions in the Western Zones, their repudiation of Potsdam decisions, their establishment of a West German currency (printed eight months before in the United States, thus proving the hypocrisy of their pretence to have been seeking for Four Power agreement) and their establishment of a West German State. They have met with derisory scorn every Soviet protest and demand to return to the basis of Four Power agreement. When now they suddenly invoke the sanctity of Four Power agreement for their "legal right" to be in Berlin, they are in the position of burglars invoking the sanctity of the rights of private property.

Lessons in Elementary Economics

Nor is their practical position much better. They thought they could get away with it. They thought they could tear Four Power agreement to pieces by setting up their West German State, thus forfeiting all further right to be in Berlin, and at the same time brazenly maintain themselves in Berlin by announcing that only war

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could shift them. In their grandiose atomic megalomania they forgot the economics of the case. They forgot that Berlin is economically dependent on the Eastern Zone and is part of the Eastern Zone. When the turn of events, through the technical interruption of transport, compelled them to face these sordid details, their amazement, chagrin and mutual recriminations at not having thought up this one beforehand provided a comic spectacle of the sudden deflation of Sir Braggadocio. When they sought to devise the typically grandiose solution of feeding a population of two millions by airmail (without light, power or employment), the air pageant diverted the population of Berlin, but the prudent Municipal Council decided to recognise only the Eastern mark, while the world was able to see how really extravagant Mr. Bevin can be, in the intervals of suing for alms *in forma pauperis*, in squandering the product of the British workers' efforts. But it is obvious to every one that this "solution" solves nothing. So the frenzied discussion spreads in the Western camp between the two alternatives, either to abandon Berlin ("unthinkable"), or to go to war ("get on with it", shout the extremists), since they are not yet willing to face the only practical alternative, to abandon the criminal London Conference decisions and return to the basis of Four Power agreement for Germany as a whole.

Western Powers' Dilemma

Hence the deepening dilemma in which the Western imperialist Munichite policy, which a short time ago was so cocksure, now finds itself involved. If they go ahead with their Western Bloc and West German State, they lose Berlin—with all that that means for the future of Germany and for the inevitable collapse of their ramshackle West German Protectorate. If they want to stay in Berlin, they have to reach a basis of Four Power Agreement. They cannot have it both ways. As this dilemma soaks in, the clamour for war as the only solution rises. But here also difficulties are revealed. It is one thing for General Clay to proclaim American bellicose determination, and demand of France and Britain and the Benelux countries how many military forces they can put in the field. The United States is far off. Britain, which is not so far off, is more hesitant. France, which is nearest, and which only adopted the London decisions by an unwilling majority of eight, is openly dismayed.

> The Americans are all for being tough, with the knowledge that in the last resort the might of the U.S.A. will win the last battle. The British are also for being firm, but they are more conscious than the Americans of the military weakness of the Western Powers. The French are in a state of great alarm.
>
> (King-Hall *National Newsletter*, 1.7.48).

However much the logical extremists may clamour for war, it does not make political sense to call on the British and French peoples to go

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to war, within three years of the defeat of Hitler, in order to set up a West German State under the same trust magnates who put Hitler in power.

" Remember Stalingrad "

The Munichite *Observer*, the Kemsley press, the *Tribune* and similar organs may blow the trumpets for war. Right Wing Social Democracy is full of martial ardour. German Social Democracy issues its marching orders to the Western Allies. This is what the British-licensed *Sozial-Demokrat* writes on July 12, 1948:

> If, as is asserted in many quarters, Russia does not want to wage war because she is unable to do so, then it should be made clear to her that, in the event of her refusing to reopen lines of communication, the Western Powers will themselves do so.

If Russia won't go to war, the Western Powers must. What splendid " Orders from Berlin"! Under the auspices of the American military authorities, another Social-Democratic stooge is set to whip up the feelings of a crowd of fifteen thousand Berliners in the American sector with the inspiring call:

> Remember Stalingrad! Now is the time to drive back the Russian wave.

Only " Heil Hitler " was missing. The spectacle of a German speaker under Anglo-American auspices invoking Stalingrad to a German audience as anti-Russian incitement is not a pretty spectacle. It is even more nauseating than the Philadelphia Convention, and beats the *Chicago Tribune* which recently ran a cartoon glorifying the " little German dachshund " which sent the great Russian Bear " fleeing for its life across 1,200 miles of Europe". But, however much the present leaders of the Anglo-American saviours of mankind and banner-bearers of " Western civilisation " may try now to reverse the history of the war, erect monuments to the misunderstood martyrs, Amery and Joyce, or declare, like Montgomery in his recent speech in Paris, that the German generals were only hanged because they were defeated, and not because they were war criminals, the fact remains that Stalingrad was not an epic of Nazi glory. The memory of Stalingrad is not a happy omen of victory for the anti-Soviet front.

The Achilles' Heel of E.R.P.

The only common-sense solution of the problem of Germany is a return to Four Power agreement and the principles of Potsdam, and a repudiation of the disruptive London Conference decisions for the partition of Germany. But here arises the other horn of the dilemma for the Western Powers. For the whole programme of E.R.P. and the Marshall Plan is based on the assumption of the establishment of the West German State as the cornerstone of the Western Bloc. If

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this collapses, if the London Conference plan collapses, then E.R.P. collapses—not in the sense that it would be impossible to devise a plan for genuine economic aid without establishing a West German State, but in the sense that the real strategic aim of the promoters, wrapped up at present under a thin camouflage of economic aid, would be defeated. The main beneficiary of American planned aid to Europe is not the former allies, Britain or France, but the former enemy, Germany—specifically, West Germany under American control. If we take the original fifteen months allocation (the final Congress revisions, not yet available in detail, have not affected the proportions), E.R.P. provided for France, $1,261m., for Britain $1,132m., and for Germany $764m.; to this must be added $230m. for U.S. financing of the West German deficit in the same period, and an additional U.S. Army appropriation of $882m. for "the prevention of disease and unrest in Germany": making a grand total of $1,816m. or £454m. for Germany, against £315m. for France and £283m. for Britain. The political, military and strategic aim of this expenditure, under cover of economic aid, is now open and admitted. As the American *Nation*, an ardent supporter of E.R.P. and Truman, has written:

> The degree to which politics and military plans today dominate economic aid is illustrated by the inclusion in the final E.R.P. bill of the military appropriations for Greece and China. This chunk of $425m. links Truman Doctrine to Marshall Plan in an indissoluble whole. Guns, goods, dollars—all are lumped together, along with the military-political purposes they represent.
>
> (New York *Nation*, 10.4.48).

Sign in Haste—Repent at Leisure

In a recent editorial on "Terms of Aid" *The Times* (30.6.48) admitted this priority of the strategic aims of E.R.P. over the professed aims of economic aid. Noting the existing British dollar deficit running at an annual rate of £500m., and that E.R.P. grants to Britain for the first year would only amount to £230m., *The Times* commented:

> Some may say, therefore, that the aid is not so large as to be indispensable. They may argue that, if it were to be rejected, prices of food and raw materials would inevitably fall because of a decrease of international purchasing power; and the result of a fall in prices might be far-reaching, since, if the relation between the prices of this country's manufactured exports and those of its imports of primary commodities were to go back to what it was in 1938, this would reduce the external deficit by over £200m. a year—that is, by about the same amount as that receivable as the first year's grant under the aid plan.

Having thus offered the engaging prospect that rejection of E.R.P. might in practice diminish this country's deficit quite as much as acceptance (shades of "no alternative" and the Bevan-Cripps scarifying pictures of mass ruin in the event of rejection), and that without

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any of the entangling conditions to strangle Britain's trading freedom and cripple recovery, *The Times* manfully turns its back on temptation, and explains that these sordid economic calculations of advantage to this country must yield place to the higher strategic aim of E.R.P. Such a weighing of economic advantage, the editorial declares,

> is not the final consideration. The Marshall Plan is designed to be a great unifying force in Europe, binding the Western countries together.

The cat is out of the bag—and, indeed, the bag was already made of such transparent materials that only a Bevin could lay his hand on his heart and declare that on his honour he could really see no cat in the bag.

Jugoslavia

In the face of this war front of Western imperialism the unity of the democratic forces of the world, and, in the first place, of the People's Democracies and the Soviet Union is more than ever important. Hence the profound international significance of the issue which has now developed with regard to the present policies of the leadership of the Communist Party and People's Republic of Jugoslavia. Imperialism, which so long looked hopefully towards Poland, in vain, and then transferred its hopes to Czechoslovakia, once again to be decisively rebuffed, now eagerly turns its hopes to Jugoslavia with greedy anticipation that here may develop the long desired breach. The *Manchester Guardian* writes (10.7.48):

> There is a hope that eventually Russia might be separated from the West by a belt of countries in Central and Eastern Europe semi-socialist in form, sympathetic to the Soviet Union, but sufficiently independent to develop their own institutions in their own way and to avoid the charge of being simply outriders of Russian imperialism. And if that happened the problem of Germany would not seem insoluble.

It is no matter for surprise that the jackals of reaction, as at every previous critical turning point and controversy within communist ranks, should seek to draw their petty profit from the unsparing exposure of errors and public ventilation of controversy on the profoundest issues of principle, and start to build their castles in the air.

Facing the Issues

No socialist who carefully studies the document of the eight parties of the Communist Information Bureau, backed with all the weight of experience of the leadership of these eight parties, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, can fail to understand the gravity of the issues involved or the urgency and necessity of the stand taken by that document. It is not merely a question of the future development of the Jugoslavian People's Republic, whose achievement is so dear to the heart of all communists and militant

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democratic fighters all over the world, that is now at stake; it is not merely the basic principles of the role of the Communist Party in the new broad popular and national movements, of the correct policy in the new class relations of the People's Democracies, and of the transition to socialism; it is the basic principles of nationalism and internationalism, decisive for the future of Europe and the world, of the unity in principle and action of the world communist movement (so rudely challenged by the refusal of the Jugoslav Communist Party leadership to participate in common discussion with the representatives of other leading parties) and of the world anti-imperialist front, that no incorrect policies should give rise to a dangerous development which could open the way to a breach in the interests of imperialism.

Role of World Communist Opinion

Once the friendly representations of brother parties had been ignored and rebuffed, once the opportunity of discussion with other parties had been refused, no alternative remained (for there is no Communist International organisation today to give disciplinary orders to a party which may be pursuing an erroneous policy) save to bring the full issues to the light of day for public discussion and settlement. But it is a measure, not of the weakness, but of the health and strength of the world communist movement, that the issues of controversy should thus be brought into the open in all their gravity, without regard to " what the enemy may say", without regard to hero worship, false diplomacy or the glamour of past achievements, should be brought to the anvil of world communist opinion, and for the final arbitrament and settlement by all the healthy elements of the Jugoslav Communist Party, in order to reach a correct solution. This has been the method of Bolshevism for forty-five years; it has always proved justified, and it has always prevailed in the end.

Grasping the Nettle

We can be confident that, whatever the difficulties still to be traversed, the issues will be cleared and the policies of Marxism-Leninism will triumph in Jugoslavia. The unequal rate of development in the present period, the appearance of new transitional political forms, the parallel existence of the first Socialist State of the world, which is still the only Socialist State in the world, and the neighbouring younger People's Democracies, still with a mixture of class elements, still only entering on the path of transition to socialism, inevitably gives rise to many new problems. So long as the basis of class division still exists, even in the most advanced People's Democracies, the danger of the penetration of alien class elements and revived expansion of capitalist relations still continues; and, failing correct communist leadership, the People's Democracy can still sink back and degenerate into the reactionary peasant national republic, drawn step by step, whatever the subjective intentions of its original

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaders, into the orbit of Western imperialism. Only the compass of Marxist-Leninist theory, only vigilant and self-critical communist leadership can defeat this danger and ensure the victorious path of advance past all the pitfalls and precipices on the way. The advance of communism throughout Europe in the not distant future must lead, not to the creation of a system of separate self-centred and exclusive States which could only reproduce old antagonisms in a new form, but to a real co-operation of the nations marching in unity to the victory of socialism and the ultimate triumph of world communism. This issue of Jugoslavia is crucial for the world's future—as important, no less for its long term than for its immediate significance, as anything that is happening in the world today. It carries lessons for every party and for the working class movement in every country. And it is a matter for congratulation that, however painful the emergence of such a crisis at this moment, the nettle has been so firmly grasped, in such a way as to mobilise the entire strength of communism for the correct solution of the problems which have arisen, in order to safeguard the future of the world democratic camp, of world peace and of communism.

July 14, 1948. R. P. D.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY *will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.*

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY *are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.*

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom,* 12 *months* 12*s. Postage paid. Abroad,* 13*s. from* LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 *Ballards Lane, London, N.*3, or *from all leading wholesalers and bookshops.*

A stencilled Discussion Guide (3s a year post free) is available on the fifteenth of each month, to assist leaders of LABOUR MONTHLY *Discussion Groups to organise a fruitful discussion of the issues raised in the current issue. Questions are posed for discussion and suggestions for further reading. The Guide, however, must be ordered in advance, and should not be confused with the pamphlet "Organised Discussion" (2d) which gives hints on the formation of Discussion Groups.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

END THE COLD WAR

By HENRY A. WALLACE*

I SUPPOSE if you had told a soldier of any nation on D-Day that four years later he would be worried about the prospect of another war, he would have laughed at your fears. I know that if you had told an American soldier that he faced the possibility, four years later, of not even having a house to live in, he would not have believed that a nation like ours would not be able to build houses for its returning soldiers. Yet that is the bitter and incredible truth.

What has happened to us since the war ended? How were the hopes and aspirations of the people shattered? How were the war savings of the people taken away from them? Today, thousands of American veterans do not have a home of their own. Millions of American citizens live under the shadow of another terrible war—a war screamed as inevitable by greedy and power-hungry men, who incapable of assuring peace-time prosperity, see huge war preparations as the only way to continue the outrageous profits they have become accustomed to.

To bring the peace which will stop the huge armament expenditures, I outlined a programme in my open letter to Stalin. Stalin accepted my letter as a basis for discussion. But the Republicans and Democrats rejected it. They have attempted to drown it in a sea of words. They refuse to talk peace. They are against peace. They dare not face the American public on the issue of war or peace. I challenged Vandenberg, Marshall and Connally to debate me on that issue. They didn't answer.

Neither Democrats nor Republicans have advanced a single definite reason why we cannot sit down with the Russians to reach a peace settlement. The reason is that they do not want a peace settlement. They cherish the cold war. They do not want it interrupted. They have no programme for international settlement. Their only programme is the cold war.

You and I know that the cold war policy is bankrupt. Nowhere is this bankruptcy more clear than in our German policy. We are at this moment forcing the French, who are afraid of the consequences, to accept our policy of setting up a western German state. All Europe is anxiously waiting to see how the Russians will react to this attempt to build up western Germany, first economically and then militarily, against the Soviets. When they react, we in turn will react against their reaction. Can't we see that this chain reaction can only lead us toward the massacre of Russians and Americans and toward the destruction of the whole of Europe? Can't we see that there is only

*Text (slightly abridged) of Broadcast over N.B.S. Network, New York, N.Y., June 6, 1948.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one way out—namely, to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union in Germany and then to reach agreement on all other issues?

Yet we have reached no peace settlement for Germany—and none is in sight. Failure to achieve a genuine German peace settlement will set the stage for World War III. The State Department tries to hide the real issues by arguing over details of occupation policy. I refuse to be drawn into such a discussion. The real requirements for making peace with Germany were established at Potsdam. They were:

To destroy the Nazi politicians and Nazi political machine.
To destroy the cartels and large landowners who inspired the Nazis and financed them.
To destroy the Nazi military machine and the war potential of Ruhr heavy industry.
To encourage formation of a united democratic Germany.
To require Germany to pay reasonable reparations to compensate for a fraction of the damage done to our Allies during the war.
To encourage and assist this new democratic Germany to build peaceful industries, and earn its way back to prosperity and membership in the family of nations.

These are sound, common-sense principles. The State Department and the Army are opposed to them. The reactionary big business men who really make American policy in Germany are opposed to these principles.

The representatives of American monopolies are just as contemptuous of the interests of the German workers and farmers as they are of the interests of American workers and farmers. They are friendly to the former Nazis whom they have appointed to key positions in government and industry, to the exclusion of German anti-fascists. The Germans they are not concerned about are the owners of I. G. Farben, Krupp, and the Schroeder banking interests. They let these war criminals go scot free. On top of this, they are restoring to the Nazi industrialists their property and economic power. Three months ago, General Clay abandoned the programme of breaking up the cartels.

Marshall and Vandenberg charge that the Russians block the economic unity of Germany. I cannot blame the Russians for opposing the plan for false economic unity which would restore to power the very same men and groups who created the war machine which laid waste the most flourishing parts of Russia.

The cold war waged by the Republican and Democratic high command makes a united Germany impossible. It makes a prosperous Germany impossible. It makes a democratic Germany impossible. And it dooms Germany to continual occupation by foreign armies. There can never be a real peace treaty with these policies.

The men who shout "red" and "communist" are not afraid of the few thousand American communists or of the Russians. They know there is already plenty of legislation on the books to enable them to prosecute any group which seeks to overthrow the government by violence. They know we are financing some eight million

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men-at-arms in the various nations of the world and that when you add to these the atom bomb there is no chance whatever that Russia will attack us. No, they have no fear of the communists of Russia. But they are afraid of the people. They are afraid of the New Party which challenges their right to the use of government in the support of greed and entrenched interests.

There is a real communist movement, but the time has come for the American people to distinguish between communism and hysteria. The real communists will not be stopped by going to war, by shooting them, outlawing them or putting them in jail. The only way to oppose an idea successfully is to have a better idea for solving the needs of the people. We must make our democracy work and stop wasting our strength in preparing for war. We must solve our problems without violence or intolerance, but we must solve them. That is the major purpose of the New Party.

Most of the propaganda weapons serve the reactionaries day after day by raising the cry of "communism" in order to obscure other international political movements of great immediate significance to Americans. One is international big business—the cartels and monopolies. They own state and local governments. They dominate both old parties. They dictate our foreign policy. They run foreign governments. Some cartels are more wealthy and more powerful than many governments and they exercise greater power in Washington than millions of voters. Individual freedom is meaningless unless we control these corporate giants.

Other powerful international movements cloak themselves behind the names of royalty and religion. Refugee champions of discarded feudalistic régimes used the United States as a base from which to operate their international.

With regard to religious freedom, we want to make ourselves unmistakably clear. We are for it, whether it be in Russia or in Eastern Europe or in any country where there may be a state church. But a disturbing attempt is being made in some quarters in America to exploit religious differences for political purposes. Freedom of religion is a sacred principle of our democracy. And for that reason it is all the more tragic that religion is sometimes used as a cloak for the most reactionary political ends—and as protective coloration for economic groups seeking to entrench their wealth and privilege. All decent Americans respect the religious feelings of their fellow citizens, whatever their professed faith may be. But when religion is used to divide and confuse people of honest faith, and when actual incitements to violence are made, then those who are truly religious must stand their ground. And when political-minded clergymen of any church try to pretend that their attack on progressive ideas and movements is a kind of Holy War, they debase religion and their iniquitous purposes must be exposed.

The New Party is proud of taking the lead in the "peace offensive". The first step is to achieve an understanding with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia to end the cold war. By reaching such an understanding we can save the principles which are being sacrificed by the bipartisans as they try to stifle civil liberties, and as they waste our resources in producing for a war no nation can win. At home we must work to fulfil the promises inherent in our Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. In the world we must work to fulfil the goals of the Charter of the United Nations.

A strong nation is not one with the most atom bombs, but one with the happiest people—the people with the least care, the highest standard of living, the least fear. That is the job facing us today—not to see how fast we can re-arm, but how quickly we can lower prices, raise wages, banish disease. That is the job requiring courage and intelligence—not the mechanical, brainless work of piling rifle upon rifle, hate upon hate. That is the job to which the New Party has dedicated itself. It is today the only real American job.

We will not be dissuaded by the atmosphere of hate around us, by the lies, the red-baiting, the unconstitutional legislation. We will unite all those who believe that the century of the common man demands a century of peace. We have the faith and the programme. And we will win.

GERMANY—THE STORM CENTRE

By J. WINTERNITZ

THE partition of Germany, prepared by the establishment of the separate bizonal administration at Frankfurt, planned in detail by the London Six-Power conference, which concluded on 1st June, and finally established by the unilateral currency reform decreed by the Western Powers on 18th June, has created a situation of utmost gravity. Four-Power co-operation in Germany has broken down: the basis is destroyed of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

Marshall, Bevin and Bidault have now manœuvred the Western Powers into an impasse. After all their strong words that " nothing short of war " would get them out of Berlin they either will have to get out with all the loss of prestige and influence they fear so much or they will have to reverse their whole course and try to find a new basis for an agreement with the U.S.S.R. They have created an absurd situation of such confusion that in the House of Commons on 30th June there was hysteria. Members on both sides of the House, excited by their leaders Bevin and Eden, were found advocating that this country should accept war rather than face the fact that with the end of Four-Power government of Germany the Western Powers have lost both the political right and the practical possibility of carrying on in Berlin. While it is hard to believe that there is anyone among those in responsible positions insane enough to envisage seriously an atomic war on this forlorn issue, the threat to peace created by these developments in Germany is a tragic reality.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

William Gallacher, the only Member of Parliament who raised his voice in protest against Munich in 1938, the only one who protested on 30th June against this crazy war drive, was right when he said that none of those who sat in the House at the time of Munich should dare to mention it now. The advocates of Western Union and of a separate Western German state are in fact returning to the discredited and bankrupt policy of Munich. The betrayal of Czechoslovakia was the price that Hitler exacted and that the Western Powers willingly paid; the essence of Munich was the attempt to decide the fate of Europe without and against the U.S.S.R. and to build up Germany as an ally and bulwark of Western imperialism against the danger of socialism threatening from the East. This is precisely what the London Six-Power Conference has tried to do. Marshall, Bevin and Bidault have to accept the responsibility for this catastrophic split on the German issue.

The basis of Four-Power co-operation in Germany was destroyed when the so-called Truman Doctrine was proclaimed and when Western Germany was included in the Marshall plan. The Potsdam agreement aimed at making Germany safe against a resurrection of fascism and militarism. The Truman Doctrine aims at making Europe safe against socialism. This is no basis for a common policy in Germany. The Potsdam agreement demands the economic unity of Germany and envisages the restoration of a politically united, independent Germany. The Marshall plan aims at subordinating Western German economy to the American controlled Western European economy. Obviously these aims are incompatible.

Bevin alleged in the House of Commons debate that the Russians had broken the Potsdam agreement by taking reparations from current production. Yet there is nothing in the Potsdam decisions which would preclude reparations from current production. But on the explicit obligation to deliver part of the plant and equipment dismantled in the Western zones to Russia and Poland on reparations account, which was openly flouted by the Western Powers, Bevin remained silent.

Bevin even tried to blame the Russians for the unilateral currency reform secretly prepared by the Western Powers and sprung upon their Russian allies without warning. The discussions on an all-German currency reform, he claimed, were broken off by the Russian walk-out from the Control Council. But after Marshal Sokolovsky left the Control Council meeting on March 20 in protest against the London Conference, the Russians publicly announced that they were prepared to continue currency negotiations. Even the *Economist* put the responsibility for this fatal step on the Western Powers:

> The Russians, who were holding out for an all-German reform, . . . have been jostled by the action of the Western Powers into carrying out a hasty reform in their Zone. (*Economist*, 26.6.48, p. 1,073).

Equally insincere is Bevin's defence of accepting Six-Power control over the heavy industrial production of the Ruhr after having

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constantly refused to accept Four-Power control, including the U.S.S.R. Bevin explained: "We are willing to have Four-Power control, but we are not willing to have a façade of Four-Power control which is virtually One-Power control, and One-Power direction." At the London Conference of Foreign Secretaries in December, 1947, Bevin objected to Four-Power control of the Ruhr in principle. It was part of the British zone and therefore Britain's responsibility, he said. But the Six-Power control of the allocation of coal, coke and steel produced in the Ruhr was accepted at another London Conference in May—although now it really means One-Power control and One-Power direction.

For there can be no doubt about the dominating position of American monopoly capital in this Western German puppet state. When in December, 1947, the Americans agreed to pay 80% of the costs of supplying Bizonia they demanded and got in exchange the control of Bizonia's foreign trade. German exports have to be paid in dollars. The British steel industry cannot get the scrap they need from the British zone, but the American controllers allowed dollars for German purchases of Swedish iron ore. True, in the "international" authority controlling the Ruhr heavy industries the U.S.A. have only three representatives among 18. But the three German votes will be controlled by the occupying powers and as for the British, French and Benelux representatives, tied to American economic policy by the Marshall chains, how could they oppose American designs in Germany? The Americans have already vetoed effectively the policy of public ownership in the Ruhr heavy industries to which Bevin had solemnly pledged himself. No less than a third of the capital in Ruhr mining is in foreign hands. Contributions for Marshall aid and occupation costs planned to the tune of $1,500 million will greatly increase the influence of American capital already very strong in the chemical, motor car and electrical industries.

American control over this still strongest concentration of heavy industry capacity, the Ruhr, is in fact the pivot of American economic domination over Western Europe; hence Mr. Marshall's irreconcilable attitude over reparations which frustrated the Four-Power conference in December; hence, too, the relentless pressure on a vacillating British and a reluctant French government to speed up the establishment of this Western German dollar colony.

The greatest fraud of all is the pretence that the Western powers have to oppose Soviet policy and to hang on to Berlin for the sake of German democracy. What a democracy, with a Constituent Assembly which will not be elected, but nominated by non-representative provincial (Laender) governments! This nominated assembly will have to frame a constitution within the strait-jacket of an Occupation Statute which envisages permanent occupation with control of foreign trade and basic industries by a foreign agency. What a democracy!

This West German puppet Government, damned to impo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tence by a reactionary federalism which gives to the provincial governments (Laender) most of the powers not expressly reserved to the occupation authorities, is nothing else than the political superstructure to an economy dominated by an alliance of foreign and German monopolists whose grip is being strengthened by a currency reform which ruins the lower middle class and weakens the working class by mass unemployment. Add to this a régime of repression against every move for unity of the Left, attempts to ban the movement for the unity of Germany while barely-camouflaged Nazis are climbing back to power, and you have a picture of the democracy for the sake of which Tory and Right wing Labour leaders threaten to declare a holy war.

This way there is no solution to the German problem, there is only disgrace and disaster. The idea that they can construct a West German state to be a bulwark and an arsenal against the U.S.S.R. and at the same time maintain an outpost in Berlin, in the centre of the Soviet zone, is contradictory and absurd.

> If the recent difficulties over Berlin are completely removed we shall be ready to discuss the Berlin situation on a Four-Power basis.

Mr. Bevin will have to eat those words—as with so many of his ill-considered statements. For obviously he will have to get Four-Power discussions first if he wants to remove the difficulties which the introduction of Western currency has created in Berlin.

There is no other way out but co-operation and agreement with all powers which fought together to defeat Hitler Germany and now want to make Europe safe against a renewal of German aggression. A clear, consistent programme for such a solution was worked out by the Warsaw Conference of the countries of Eastern Europe, countries which suffered worst from German aggression and did the most to defeat it. These countries, which certainly have no cause to be too tender to the Germans, recognise the right of the German nation to have their own united independent state, to get a peace treaty and to see an end of foreign occupation. A conspiracy of silence has withheld this eminently reasonable programme from the British public.

Here is the programme, set forth in the last paragraph of the Declaration of the Warsaw Conference, adopted on 24th June:

> In accordance with the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements on Germany, the Governments of the U.S.S.R., Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania and Hungary believe that the following problems should be settled in the first place, without any delay:
>
> 1. Implementation of the measures ensuring the final demilitarisation of Germany, by agreement among Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., France and the United States.
> 2. Institution for a definite time of control by the four Powers—Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., France and the United States—over Ruhr heavy industry with a view to developing peace branches of Ruhr industry and preventing the re-establishment of Germany's war potential.
> 3. Establishment, by agreement among the Governments of Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., France and the United States, of a provisional

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democratic, peace-loving Government for the whole of Germany, composed of representatives of the democratic parties and organisations of Germany, for the purpose of creating a guarantee against a repetition of German aggression.

4. Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in accordance with the Potsdam decisions, so that the occupation troops of all Powers should be withdrawn from Germany within one year after the conclusion of the peace treaty.
5. Elaboration of measures for the fulfilment by Germany of her reparations obligations towards States which suffered from German aggression.

This is a programme which is not only in full harmony with the interests of all the nations which want security against a renewal of Germany's military power, it is a programme which also offers a prospect for the German people, recognising its right to self-determination and a just peace. The injustice of the partition of Germany must—as the Warsaw resolution points out—give food to the ideas of revenge and chauvinism in Germany and create conditions for the emergence of new Bismarcks or even new Hitlers. It is the only hope for a future of peace and progress that the democratic movement for Germany's unity represented by the People's Congress will win in the end.

The success of the petition for Germany's unity which mustered about fifteen million signatures (or about thirty-seven per cent. of Germany's total voting strength) in spite of the bans imposed in the American and French zones, is an encouraging portent, and an augury that this time the democratic forces of the German people will be able to accomplish what they failed to achieve a hundred years ago.

The reactionaries are frantic about the situation in Germany because they feel this weakness of their cause. They seem to fear negotiations with the U.S.S.R. The Minister of State, Mr. McNeil, had the effrontery to say in the debate on Germany:

> No one who has looked at the hours that have been spent on the highest political level in an attempt to secure Four-Power agreement upon the subject of Germany can be otherwise than appalled at the prospect of resuming it.

These gentlemen " on the highest level " calmly envisage a war for Berlin, they seem not to mind a few million lives squandered in another war, but they are " appalled " when they remember the 300 hours of their precious time devoted to the task of finding a common ground with the Soviet Union.

In the great fight between the forces working for peace and the forces making for war, Germany has again become one of the most important battle-grounds. If the working people of this country throw their weight in on the right side, there is no doubt that the cause of peace will win.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SPAIN

By LON ELLIOTT

THE hot sun that beats down on Spain does not deal kindly with Mr. Bevin's foreign policy. It scatters the mists of woolly argument and alleged good intentions so beloved by our Foreign Secretary, and it leaves ugly realities exposed as what they are. Nowhere is Bevin's betrayal of democracy seen more clearly than in Spain. Nowhere do the great issues of war and peace stand out in sharper focus. And on no other aspect of foreign policy is it harder to mislead the British Labour Movement, with its fine tradition of solidarity with the Spanish Republicans.

In recent years Mr. Bevin has seldom spoken of Spain except when he has been obliged to, and then he has said as little as possible. That wily and experienced politician prefers to do battle on ground of his own choosing. It would suit him best if Spain never figured on a conference agenda and was never mentioned in the House of Commons.

A recent sequence of events is characteristic of the Labour Government's handling of the Spanish question ever since 1945. In March of this year the Labour Party sent greetings to the congress of the Spanish Socialist Party, meeting in Toulouse. Signed by Mr. Morgan Phillips, the message denounced Franco and all his works, praised the heroism of the Republican fighters, and expressed complete solidarity with the Spanish Socialists. Only a few weeks later it was announced that the Labour Government had dispatched a mission to Madrid to negotiate a new trade and commercial agreement with Franco. Soon it emerged that this new agreement provided for greatly increased trade, on terms very favourable to Franco, and for the shipment of large quantities of British coal to Spain. On June 25th, Britain's representative joined the United States in preventing the Security Council from even discussing the Franco dictatorship, despite a strong plea by Mr. Gromyko and a letter urging its inclusion on the agenda from Mr. Trygve Lie, United Nations Secretary-General.

Here it is in a nutshell. Verbal condemnation of Franco and lip-service to Spanish democracy are followed unfailingly by very real economic assistance to the Fascist régime and determined efforts to prevent any international action against it.

Naturally enough, the sheer hypocrisy of this policy has disgusted some of the Labour Government's staunchest supporters. In a recently published book, Mr. Francis Noel-Baker, M.P., is forced to admit that "in Europe great damage has been done to our prestige by the suspicion that some hidden interest has prevented bolder action on our part." Nevertheless, the "interest" which prevents bolder action is far from being *hidden*, as we suspect Mr. Noel-Baker well knows.

Right-wing leaders of the Spanish Socialist Party, typical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exponents of the policy of the "Third Force", have no illusions about it. Faced with the difficult task of convincing their members that the correct policy is one of "war against the Communists, and peace with the Monarchists and Generals", they frankly admit that they are working under British and American orders. Without mincing their words, they say that London and Washington will stand by Franco until such time as they can see an alternative Government, which will provide them with equally favourable military and economic guarantees and will suppress the Communists as vigorously as he does, and preferably much more effectively.

Indalecio Prieto, now President of the Spanish Socialist Party, told its congress that as long ago as October, 1945, a certain Government "made it known that it was not prepared to help us in any way if we had joint commitments with the Communists". The reference was clearly to the United States. "This hint", he added, "did not shock me, because ever since 1921, ever since Communism arose, I have defined my attitude by saying that I will never obey Moscow." But his whole speech showed that he was willing to crawl on his belly at the behest of Washington and London. He said that if Franco collapsed without there being a Government "satisfactory to the Western Powers" ready to take his place, "one of those Powers seems prepared to come to his assistance and administer oxygen, for it considers that the alternative would be for Spain to go down in chaos, and this it will not permit".

Frantic manipulations of the Red Bogy were his answer to the U.S. General Staff and others who believe that Franco and his army would be a useful asset in a war against the Soviet Union. When such a war broke out, he told them, the Soviet Union would arm the Spanish people, "who, if they are given arms while still living under the jackboot of a bloody beast, will take those arms in order to destroy him, whatever the consequences". (*Loud applause from the delegates.*)

Prieto is doing all he can to persuade his masters that he is a better anti-Communist than Franco. Franco, he says, has managed to survive by claiming to have a monopoly in anti-communism. "This assertion of his is completely false." And he goes on to stake his own not inconsiderable claim. In his efforts to establish his reputation as a reliable reactionary Prieto even goes to the length of flirting openly with Franco's fascists. In a speech on June 6th, he said that in his political testament the Falangist leader, José Antonio Primo de Rivera, "proposed a solution similar to that which we are advocating".

Primo de Rivera, he added, drew up a plan for a Government "in which I figured as a Minister". And, in a phrase calculated to absolve the fascists from countless crimes, Prieto declared "Franco personifies Franco-ism, but not Falangism".

When talk like this comes from their leader, it is scarcely surprising that demoralisation and despair are rife among those

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialists who have supported Prieto—and they are by no means all Spanish Socialists. At the Socialist congress in March, the party's General Secretary, Rodolfo Llopis, dolefully confessed: "I have had a great failure. We have had a great failure."

Meanwhile, without them and in spite of them, a powerful Resistance Movement has come into being in Spain.

It has long been apparent that a free and independent Spain does not fit into the scheme of things as envisaged by Messrs. Bevin and Marshall. No one, not even the most optimistic and ill-informed member of the Foreign Office staff, can seriously imagine that such a Spain would join in an anti-Soviet crusade. By kind permission of General Franco, however, Spain, together with her African colonies, is already being developed as an important war base. The Americans have constructed a number of airfields for heavy bombers, and there are persistent reports that a secret military pact has been concluded between the U.S. Government and Franco. It is clear that the American reactionaries will not part with this war base, controlling the entrance to the Mediterranean, if they can possibly avoid it. Alvin O'Konski put their point of view when he persuaded the American House of Representatives to vote for Franco's inclusion in the Marshall Plan:

> If you will look at the map of Europe and look what Spain has done to Communism in the past, there is where you will find your greatest bulwark against Communism in Europe. I say so to you, knowing the danger of Communism as I do, we need Spain more than Spain needs us.

Similar arguments have been used in the House of Commons and in the correspondence columns of *The Times*. In fact, a Tory campaign has been launched in Britain to bring Franco into Western Union and the Marshall Plan. In the House of Commons Mr. C. Mayhew, on behalf of the Government, was obliged to answer a demand put forward by Mr. R. A. Butler, who wanted an assurance that "Spain will be available in the general view of Western Union or a Mediterranean settlement". "Franco must go first", replied Mr. Mayhew. "The success of E.R.P. depends on having an underlying moral basis."

There is the dilemma. To include Franco in the Marshall Plan or in Western Union is to show up those projects in their true light—as imperialist war plans having nothing in common with democracy and peace. To exclude Franco, on the other hand, is to increase the possibility of his speedy downfall.

Franco's régime is already on the verge of economic collapse—just how near is shown in the latest report by the chairman of the big Urquijo Bank, in which he declares that Spain's industrial equipment is worn out; the railways do not function; the land is barren; and to reach the 1935 level of production foreign aid to the tune of over a thousand million dollars would be required.

Politically, Franco's case is no better. A big change has taken place in the political atmosphere in Spain during the last year. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intolerable conditions and the disappearance of illusions about British and American intentions have led to a rapid growth of the Resistance Movement, led by the Communist Party. Already the situation is such that the leaders of the strongest guerrilla force in Spain have announced their intention of calling a conference of all anti-Franco organisations in order to form a Central Resistance Council and draw up a common programme. Guerrilla units are acting as the spearhead of a vast peasant movement. Here is what Santiago Carrillo, one of the Communist leaders, says about them:

> We should be under-rating the importance of these brave guerrilla fighters if we only took account of their record of guerrilla operations. More important than these operations—and they are very important—is the fact that around the Guerrilla Force of Levante and Aragon there are organised tens of thousands of peasants—to a certain extent the entire countryside in the provinces of Teruel, Castellon and Valencia, and a large part of Cuenca, Saragossa, Lerida, Tarragona, Guadalajara and Albacete. Every guerrillero is a mass leader.

Even Prieto, who on innumerable occasions has tried to belittle the role of the Spanish Communist Party, now says that "in Spain there are only two forms of political propaganda. There is Franco propaganda with its banners unfurled and all resources at its disposal. And there is underground, Communist propaganda".

People who had no previous connection with the Republican movement—even officials appointed by Franco, Mayors and village priests—are co-operating with the guerrillas. *Somatenistas,* members of the volunteer militia formed by Franco to combat the Resistance, have in a number of cases handed over their weapons without a fight. Opposition to Franco is expressed on any and every occasion. A correspondent in Madrid writes:

> I should like to mention an incident which shows the way the wind is blowing. I was at a football match the other week, Madrid v. Barcelona. All round the ground were thousands of Falangists who were guests of Franco at a big rally which was to be held the following day. When the final whistle went for time, everybody stood up and slung the cushions they had been sitting on at the Falangists. The way it started you would have thought it had all been arranged. The police were lost in the crowd as they tried to stop it. They made a few arrests, but they, too, got pelted. The outcome of it was, the club was fined 20,000 pesetas. It did my old heart good to see it.

The powerful anti-Franco movement which has come into existence is described by Santiago Carrillo as being "broader in scope than any unity movement which our country has seen". Those who remember the Spanish People's Front will appreciate the significance of those words.

The British and American Governments are determined that, come what may, this democratic popular movement must not be allowed to succeed. Differences may exist about tactics—whether to go all out in backing Franco, or whether to risk a palace revolution and replace him by a Government of Monarchists, lesser-known Fascists and Prieto-ites. But the main thing, in the eyes of Bevin and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marshall, is to prevent the emergence of a democratic and independent Spain. Such a Spain would throw all their war plans out of gear.

And that is one reason, among others, why it behoves progressive people in Britain to work harder to help the democrats of Spain, to frustrate Mr. Bevin's plans for turning Spain into a second Greece, and to ensure the downfall of the Fascist Franco.

INDUSTRIAL BATTLEFRONT

By GEORGE ALLISON

THE recent strike of London dockers has a deep political significance for the working class and the Government that has still to be appreciated.

It would be difficult to find in trade union annals any other working-class action that withstood such a many-sided attack. From the word " go " the Press indulged in a provocative campaign designed to misrepresent the dockers' case and to line the public up against them. Frenzied efforts were made to discover or even manufacture "vile communist plots" underlying the whole action. In Parliament the Tories endeavoured to make capital out of the issue, and goaded the Government into taking the strongest repressive measures against the dockers. Troops were called in, the trade union leaders blustered and thundered, and ultimately the Government declared a state of emergency, and invoked the Emergency Powers Act—all for the purpose of intimidating the dockers and ultimately breaking their resistance.

Perhaps the most important thing about this strike is that all these efforts failed. As the Labour Correspondent of *The Times* very pertinently pointed out, the strike was started, conducted and ended under the leadership of the Strike Committee, a body consisting in the main of rank and file trade union officials who found themselves sharply at variance with the leadership of their unions and the Government for which they voted so solidly and hopefully in 1945.

Anyone who attended the mass meetings of the Strike Committee was bound to be impressed by the authority of the Committee and the sea of trade union cards held aloft at every vote.

Basically the fight centred on the dignity and status of dock labour, and was directed against the system of punishments and penalties reminiscent of the days when Tom Mann and Ben Tillett were leading the fight for the elementary demands of the dock labourers.

But the real significance of the fight lies in the firm determination shown by the dockers, their magnificent fighting spirit, masterly restraint and effective organisation, and the fact that their fight represents to a very large degree the feeling now developing throughout the organised labour movement.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have moved a long way from the mood and the feelings which predominated in the earlier part of the year.

We can recall the gravity with which the economic situation was put before the country; the serious warnings issued by the trade unions leading up to the Conference of Executives and the endorsement of the Government's wage-freeze proposals; the promises held out that something would be done about prices and profits, and the gilded pictures put forward with regard to Marshall Aid.

And, of course, parallel with all this came the present campaign against communism, the "witch-hunt" and the subsequent purge.

Such was the atmosphere created in preparation for the trade union, co-operative and Labour Party conferences meeting earlier in the year.

The vastly different situation now prevailing is sharply characterised by three main features:

First, the complete lack of confidence throughout the eight-million strong trade union movement in arbitration machinery within the framework of Government policy; secondly, the pledges solemnly given at the conference of trade union executives that something would be done about prices and profits have plainly fizzled out and added to this lack of faith; and, thirdly, the complete failure of the Government to respond, apart from a few complimentary phrases, to the move made by the Co-operative Societies to break down the prices spiral.

By way of contrast, note must be taken of the militant attitude adopted by most of the most recent trade union conferences. In every instance, there is the insistence that wage claims be pursued with the utmost vigour; in most cases, peremptory dismissal of resolutions couched in the spirit of the Morgan Phillips' witch-hunt appeal; and in general, a more searching and critical attitude towards the whole line of Government policy both at home and abroad.

The fighting spirit shown, for example, at the Annual Conference of Trades Councils, the Civil Service Clerical Association, the Foundry Workers' Conference, and at the National Committee of the A.E.U. is indicative of a developing political mood that must command attention.

Undoubtedly wages, as opposed to the continual rise in prices, are the main, vital issue; but grave fears are beginning to develop on other questions. Even before the Marshall Plan begins to operate misgivings are expressed by the employers in the shipyards concerning the future of the trade. Apprehensions already expressed by the workers on the Clyde and Tyneside are now being more forcibly echoed throughout the trade. Similarly, in building and some sections of engineering the old dread of mass unemployment is returning. As the realities of the Marshall Plan become evident and restrictions are imposed on the development of trade with the Colonies, Eastern Europe and Soviet Union, these doubts and fears can only deepen.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As against this, note must be taken of the growing demand in nationalised and non-nationalised industries on the part of the trade unions to come to grips with the real problems. The demand for a change in the composition of the Boards in the nationalised industries, and the pressure for workers' participation in the day-to-day running of these concerns goes far deeper than a mere change of personnel. It denotes an earnest desire on the part of the workers to see a complete change in the way in which the nationalised industries are run.

The old arguments are wearing thin. The one-sided appeals directed by Bevin and Gaitskell to the miners and the grim warnings against rising coal prices can only mean that the problems of the industry and the need for more coal are to be solved at the expense of the miners.

Add to that the most recent announcement of power cuts from October to March and the staggering of hours, and you have a grim picture facing every section of the working class in the months that lie ahead.

The whole situation presents a challenge to the movement. The appeals for blind loyalty made by the Labour Government are not having the same magical effects. Genuine political criticism is not now so easily silenced by anti-communist "diversion". The gathering forces are being more sharply confronted by the need to challenge the whole policy now being pursued by the Government and to bring about drastic changes in the interests of the working class.

The fight on the wages front; the continual battle against rising prices and soaring profits; the demand for real planning; and the earnestness of the workers to grapple with the problems of their own specific industries are in reality all aspects of the same fight. This fight calls for sustained action in Parliament and, on the industrial field, to bring the Labour movement back to the mood and rally it around the perspectives seen by the working class in 1945.

Trade unionists who may be delegates to conferences or preparing annual reports should note these articles on wages and workshop issues in Labour Monthly in 1948:

"Deflation and the Economic Crisis" by Professor Maurice Dobb (January).
"Trade Unions and Communism" by Arthur Horner (February; also as a 3d pamphlet).
"The Offensive Against Labour Unity" by Harry Adams (April).
"Guns or Butter" by J. R. Campbell (May).
"Strings or Chains?" by D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P. (June).
"Caste System in Britain" by P. H. H. Bryan (June).
"Two Impressions of Scarborough" by Steve Lawther and Tom Gittins (July).
"The Wage Freeze" by Jim Gardner (July).

Some are still available; but to ensure not missing such important contributions, readers should order regularly through newsagents or take out a postal subscription (12*s yearly*, 6*s half-yearly*, *Overseas* 13*s yearly; post free from* 134 *Ballards Lane, London, N.*3).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

100 Years Ago

MARX ON THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN BRITAIN

Marx on 3rd August received a note from the police informing him that the Government henceforward would deem him to be a foreigner. The next day Marx signed the invitation of the Cologne Democratic Societies to all Democratic Societies in the Rhineland to hold a Congress. Engels, also on 4th August, told the general meeting of the Cologne democrats of the attempt to deprive Marx of his citizenship. The Cologne democrats arranged a deputation to the Prussian government. At the first Democratic Congress of the Rhineland, on August 13th and 14th, Marx was present with Engels, Wolff and Schapper, but did not speak: in any case only matters of organisation were discussed. A week later Marx lodged a formal protest with Kuehlwetter, Prussian Minister of the Interior (who on 12th September replied rejecting it); and the next day set off for Vienna to make contact there with the left wing of the democratic party and with the Viennese workers' organisations—and also with the object of bringing back some funds to keep the Gazette going. He went via Berlin where he had talks with leaders of the democratic movement and also met Bakunin there. He left Berlin on 26th August and reached on the 28th, Vienna, where he met the radical leaders, took part in meetings and made the personal acquaintance of the Vienna Correspondent of the Gazette. That evening there was a meeting of the Democratic Society to discuss the street fighting in Vienna a week earlier. Marx at once took part, spoke against Froebel and Jellinek, who wanted to go to the Austrian Emperor with a petition, and demanded a tactic directed to decisive struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie. On 30th August Marx gave greetings to the First Vienna Workers' Union.

Taking as his text a leading article in the Cologne Zeitung *which declared: "Where in England is there any trace of hatred towards the class that in France is called the bourgeoisie? The bourgeois in England enjoys no privileges, he is the child of his industriousness", Marx wrote the following article:*

NEUE RHENISCHE ZEITUNG, AUGUST 1, 1848.

It is indeed, remarkable! Britain has the most numerous, the most concentrated, the most classic proletariat, a proletariat that every five or six years is decimated by the most destructive misery of a commercial crisis, by hunger and typhus, that for half its lifetime in industry is superfluous and lacking bread. In Britain, every tenth man is a pauper, and every third pauper is a prisoner in the bastilles of the poor law. In Britain, the poor law administration costs annually almost as much as the total expenditure of the Prussian State. In Britain, misery and pauperism are openly declared a necessary factor of the present-day industrial system and national wealth. And, in spite of this—where in Britain is there any trace of hatred towards the bourgeoisie?

In no other country in the world is the contradiction between proletariat and bourgeoisie developed to such a height as in Britain with its mass proletariat; no other country in the world exhibits such a crying contrast between the deepest poverty and the most colossal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wealth. And in spite of this, where is there any trace of hatred towards the bourgeoisie?

Of course! Combinations of workers, secret until 1825, open since 1825, combinations not for a day against a single factory owner, but combinations of permanent duration against whole groups of factory owners, combinations of whole branches of industry, of entire towns, combinations, finally, of innumerable workers throughout Britain, all these combinations and their innumerable struggles against the factory owners, their strikes, which led to acts of violence, avenging demolitions, arson, armed onslaughts, assassinations, all these are just so many proofs of the love of the proletariat for the bourgeoisie!

The whole war of the workers against the factory owners, which has now lasted some eighty years, which began with machine-wrecking and which has developed through combinations, isolated attacks on the person and property of the factory owners and the few workers attached to them, through greater or lesser uprisings, through the insurrections of 1839 and 1842 to the most developed class struggle that the world has yet seen: this whole class struggle of the Chartists, of the constituted party of the proletariat, against the constituted State force of the bourgeoisie, a struggle which has not yet led to frightful bloody collisions like the June battle in Paris, but which is being waged with much greater permanence, by much greater masses and on a much larger arena; this social, civil war is, of course, for the *Cologne Zeitung* and its editor only a single, lengthy proof of the love of the British proletariat for its bourgeoisie! . . .

How long ago is the time when it was the fashion to depict Britain as the classic land of social antagonisms and struggles and, in view of England's so-called "industrial conditions" to account France happy in its bourgeois king, its bourgeois parliamentary fighters and its worthy workers who always fought so valiantly for the bourgeoisie! How long ago it is since the *Cologne Zeitung* struck this note day after day and found reason, because of the British class struggles, to warn Germany from a protective system and the "unnatural" hothouse industry developing as a result of it. The terrors of the June battles have taken possession of the *Cologne Zeitung* and the millions of Chartists of London, Manchester and Glasgow, pale to insignificance in the face of the 40,000 Parisian insurgents.

France has become the classic land of hatred of the bourgeoisie, and according to the present assertions of the *Cologne Zeitung* has been so since 1830. It is peculiar! While English agitators at meetings, in pamphlets and in magazines, for ten years now to the applause of the entire proletariat have been calling for the most burning hatred against the bourgeoisie, the French working class and socialist literature has always preached reconciliation with the bourgeoisie and has based itself precisely on the argument that class antagonisms are far less developed in France than in England. And precisely those persons, such as Louis Blanc, Cabet, Caussidiere, Ledru-Rollin, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere mention of whose names causes the *Cologne Zeitung* to cross itself three times, preached peace with the bourgeoisie for years before and after the February Revolution, and did so usually with the greatest display of good faith . . .

The *Cologne Zeitung* is not content, however, with the mere assertion of the fact that in England there exists no hatred of "what in France is called the bourgeoisie" (also in England, learned colleague—see the *Northern Star* during the last two years), it also explains just why this is so and could not be otherwise.

Peel saved the British bourgeoisie from hatred by abolishing monopoly and establishing free trade. "It is Peel's measures that have saved England from a most frightful revolution".

By abolishing the monopoly of the *aristocracy,* Peel saved the *bourgeoisie* from the threatening hatred of the proletariat—wonderful logic of the *Cologne Zeitung*!

"The British people realises daily more and more that it is only from free trade that one can hope for a solution of the vital questions which include all present sufferings and cares, a solution which in recent times has been sought with streams of blood. Let us not forget that the first free trade ideas emanated from the British people".

The British people! But since 1839 the "British people" has been fighting the free trade men in all its meetings and in the press; it forced them, at the height of the glory of the Anti-Corn Law League, to assemble in secret and to make access to their meetings dependent on possession of a card, with the bitterest irony it put the free traders' practice alongside their beautiful words, it completely identified bourgeois with free traders! The British people has even been compelled from time to time momentarily to use the aid of the aristocracy, of the monopolists, against the bourgeoisie—e.g. in the Ten Hour question—and this people, which is so well capable of expelling the free traders from the platform of open meetings, this "British people" is supposed to be the originator of free trade ideas? Childish simplicity of the *Cologne Zeitung,* which not only mechanically repeats the illusions of the big capitalists of Manchester and Leeds, but also credulously listens to all their deliberate lies!

"The bourgeois in England enjoys no privileges, no monopoly" . . .

The worthy *Cologne Zeitung* knows no other "monopoly" than that of a customs tariff, that is a monopoly which only apparently presses on the workers but in reality presses on the bourgeoisie, all those industrialists who do not benefit from the protective tariff. The *Cologne Zeitung* knows no other monopoly than that attacked by the free traders from Adam Smith to Cobden, local law-enacted monopoly.

The monopoly of capital, however, the monopoly that exists without legislation and often in spite of legislation, this has no existence for the gentlemen of the *Cologne Zeitung.* And it is precisely this monopoly that weighs directly and inexorably on the workers, that gives rise to the struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie! It is precisely this monopoly that is the specifically

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modern form of monopoly, the product of which is modern class contradictions; and it is precisely the resolution of these contradictions that is the specific task of the nineteenth century!

The monopoly of capital, however, becomes more powerful, more all-embracing, more menacing in the same degree as the other small and local monopolies disappear.

The freer competition is through the removal of all "monopolies", the more rapidly does capital become concentrated in the hands of an industrial feudalism, the more rapidly does the small bourgeoisie become ruined, the quicker does the land of capitalist monopoly, England, subordinate the surrounding countries to its industry. Remove the "monopoly" of the French, German, Italian bourgeoisie, and Germany, France and Italy sink to proletarians in the face of the all-absorbing British bourgeoisie.

The pressure which the individual British bourgeois exercises on the individual British proletarian, that same pressure will be exercised by the whole British bourgeoisie on Germany, France and Italy, and it will be the small bourgeoisie of these countries who will especially suffer under it.

These are platitudes which nowadays one may not expound to anyone without insulting them—excepting the learned gentlemen of the *Cologne Zeitung*.

These deep thinkers see in free trade the only means of saving France from a war of annihilation between workers and bourgeois. Indeed, to force down the bourgeoisie of the country also into the proletariat, that is a means of resolving class contradictions worthy of the *Cologne Zeitung*!

Document of the Month

SITUATION IN GERMANY AND BERLIN: SOVIET REPLY

The reply of the Soviet Government on July 14 to the Note from the British Government of July 6 was as follows:

I

The Soviet Government has acquainted itself with the Note of the Government of Great Britain of July 6 of this year in which the situation which has now arisen in Berlin is explained by the measures taken by the Soviet side.

The Soviet Government cannot agree with this statement of the Government of Great Britain and believes that the present situation in Berlin has arisen as a result of the violation by the Governments of Great Britain, the United States and France of the agreed decisions adopted by the Four Powers in relation to Germany and Berlin, expressed in the carrying out of a separate currency reform, the introduction of special currency notes for the western sectors of Berlin, and the policy of dismembering Germany. The Soviet Government repeatedly warned those

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

three Governments of the responsibility they were incurring by taking the path of violation of the agreed decisions with respect to Germany previously adopted by the four Powers.

The decisions adopted at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, as well as the four-Power agreement on control machinery in Germany, set as their aim the demilitarization and democratization of Germany, the undermining of the very basis of German militarism, and the prevention of the revival of Germany as an aggressive Power, and hence the conversion of Germany into a peace-loving and democratic State. These agreements stipulate Germany's obligation to pay reparations and thus, even if only partially, to compensate for the damage done to the countries which suffered from German aggression.

In accordance with these agreements the Governments of the four Powers accepted responsibility for administering Germany and undertook to determine jointly the status of Germany or of any areas, including Berlin, which are part of German territory, and to conclude a peace treaty with Germany, which must be signed by a Government of democratic Germany adequate for the purpose.

These highly important agreements of the four Powers in relation to Germany have been violated by the Governments of Great Britain, the United States of America and France. Measures for the demilitarization of Germany have not been completed, and such an important centre of German war industry as the Ruhr region has been removed from the control of the four Powers. Fulfilment of the decision on reparations from the western zones of occupation of Germany has been disrupted by the Governments of Great Britain, the U.S.A. and France. By their separate actions the quadripartite control machinery in Germany has been destroyed, as a result of which the Control Council has ceased to function.

Since the London Conference of three Powers, with the participation of the Benelux countries, measures are being carried out by the Governments of Great Britain, the U.S.A. and France aimed at splitting and dismembering Germany, including the preparation now taking place for the appointment of a separate government for the Western zones of Germany and the separate currency reform carried out on June 18 of this year for the Western zones of occupation.

Inasmuch as the position which has arisen in Berlin, as in the whole of Germany, is a direct consequence of the systematic violation of the decisions of the Potsdam Conference by the Governments of Great Britain, the U.S.A. and France, as also of the agreement of the four Powers on control machinery in Germany, the Soviet Government must reject as altogether unfounded the declaration of the Government of Great Britain to the effect that the measures for restricting transport communications between Berlin and the Western zones of occupation of Germany, introduced by the Soviet Command to protect the economy of the Soviet zone from disorganisation, allegedly constitute a violation of existing agreements relating to the administration of Berlin.

II

The Government of Great Britain declares that it occupies its sector in Berlin by a right deriving from the defeat and surrender of Germany, referring in this connexion to the agreement between the four Powers in relation to Germany and Berlin. This only goes to confirm that the exercise of the above-mentioned right in regard to Berlin is bound up with the obligatory fulfilment by the Powers occupying Germany of the quadripartite agreements concluded between them in relation to Germany as a whole.

In accordance with these agreements, Berlin was envisaged as the seat of the supreme authority of the four Powers occupying Germany, and agreement was reached on the administration of "Greater Berlin" under the direction of the Control Council. Thus, the agreement on quadripartite administration of Berlin

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constitutes an inseparable component part of the agreement on quadripartite administration of Germany as a whole.

When Great Britain, the United States and France, by their separate actions in the western zones of Germany, destroyed the system of quadripartite administration of Germany and began to create in Frankfurt-on-Main a capital for a Government of western Germany, they thereby undermined also the legal basis on which rested their right to participate in the administration of Berlin.

The Government of Great Britain points out in its Note that its right to stay in Berlin is also based on the fact that Great Britain withdrew its troops from certain areas of the Soviet zone of occupation which they had entered during the period of military operations in Germany, and that, had it foreseen the situation which has arisen in Berlin, it would not have withdrawn its troops from these areas.

However, the Government of Great Britain knows very well that, by withdrawing its troops to the confines of the British zone as established in the four-Power agreement on the zones of occupation in Germany, it merely fulfilled the obligations it had undertaken, the fulfilment of which alone could give Great Britain the right to take her troops to Berlin.

Perusal of President Truman's letter to Premier Stalin of June 14, 1945, and Premier Stalin's letter in reply of June 16, 1945, and similar correspondence between Stalin and Churchill, which are mentioned in the Note of the Government of Great Britain, confirms that owing to the agreement then reached the troops of Great Britain, the United States and France obtained the possibility of entering both Berlin—the capital of Germany—and Vienna—the capital of Austria—which, as is known, were captured only by the troops of the Soviet army. It is also known that the above-mentioned agreements on Berlin and Vienna were only a part of the agreements on Germany and Austria, on the fulfilment of which the Soviet Government continues to insist.

III

The Government of Great Britain declares that the temporary measures introduced by the Soviet command for restricting transport communications between Berlin and the western zones have created difficulties in the supply of the Berlin population of the western sectors. It cannot, however, be denied that these difficulties were caused by the actions of the United States, British, and French Governments, and above all by their separate actions in introducing a new currency in the western zones of Germany and a special currency in the western sectors of Berlin.

Berlin is in the centre of the Soviet zone and is part of that zone. The interests of the Berlin population do not admit of a situation where there has been introduced into Berlin, or even only into the western sectors of Berlin, a special currency which is not in circulation in the Soviet zone. Moreover, the introduction of a separate currency reform in the western zones of Germany placed Berlin, and with it the entire Soviet zone of occupation, in a position where the entire mass of currency notes invalidated in the western zones threatened to pour into Berlin and into the Soviet occupation zone of Germany.

The Soviet command was compelled therefore to adopt urgent measures to safeguard the interests of the German population as well as the economy of the Soviet zone of occupation and the area of "Greater Berlin". The danger of disruption of the normal economic activity of the Soviet zone of occupation and Berlin has not been averted even yet, since Great Britain, the United States and France continue to maintain their own special currency in Berlin.

At the same time, the Soviet command has constantly manifested, and continues to manifest, concern for the well-being of the Berlin population and for ensuring it normal supplies of everything necessary, and is striving for the speediest elimination of the difficulties which have recently arisen

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this matter. Moreover, if necessary, the Soviet Government will not object to ensuring sufficient supplies for the whole of "Greater Berlin" by its own means.

As regards the declaration of the Government of Great Britain that it will not be induced by threats, pressure or other actions to abandon its right to participate in the occupation of Berlin, the Soviet Government does not intend to enter into a discussion of this declaration, for it has no need of a policy of pressure, since by violation of the agreed decisions on the administration of Berlin the above-mentioned Governments are themselves rendering null and void their right to participation in the occupation of Berlin.

IV

The Government of Great Britain in its Note of July 6 expresses readiness to begin negotiations between the four allied occupying Powers for discussion of the situation which has arisen in Berlin, but passes over in silence the question of Germany as a whole. While not objecting to negotiations, the Soviet Government, however, deems it necessary to declare that it cannot link the start of these negotiations with the fulfilment of any preliminary conditions, and that, secondly, quadripartite negotiations could only be effective if they were not confined to the question of the administration of Berlin, since this question cannot be separated from the general question of quadripartite control in relation to Germany.

Trade Unions
and
Communism
by
ARTHUR HORNER
THREEPENCE
(off-print from February issue)

Book Review

The 1848 Manifesto Mishandled

IN 1937 Mr. C. R. Attlee (then as now leader of the Labour Party) published a book, *The Labour Party in Perspective*, in which he declared (p. 26) that on the Continent Socialist movements were "inspired by the word revealed to Marx", but that in Britain history has been "entirely different". The number of those who accepted Marxism has always been "small". Those who entered the Socialist movement as the direct result of Marx's teaching have been "but a fraction of the whole". The inspiration of most British Socialists must be sought "in other directions".

Clear, isn't it? And now read what the Labour Party leaders wrote officially in 1948, in their foreword to the edition of the *Communist Manifesto* prepared by Professor Laski: "The Labour Party acknowledges its indebtedness to Marx and Engels as two of the men who have been the inspiration of the whole working-class movement." The ideas of British Socialists have been different from those of continental Socialism, "but we, too, have been influenced in a hundred ways by European thinkers and fighters, and above all by the authors of the *Manifesto*". These, it now appears, were not after all soothsayers uttering "the word revealed to Marx", but were "drawing mainly on English experience". No one reading the *Manifesto's* "detailed programme" can doubt "our common inspiration".

It might almost seem that in 1937, when outside the U.S.S.R. there were only some 1,400,000 Communists, the Labour Party leaders felt free to write in a tone of scornful British superiority about the continental Marx: whereas in 1948, when there are about 14 million Communists in the non-Soviet countries, they sing a different tune.

Yet it is only the tune that is different, adapted to the times: the words

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remain the same. We need not go far beyond the fundamental principles of the *Manifesto* to illustrate this.

The Labour Party's foreword gives a running commentary on how the Labour Government has applied what it calls the "detailed programme" of the *Manifesto* which would make a cat laugh.

But what the Labour Party leaders omit to mention is that these measures, according to the *Manifesto*, are not a "detailed programme" at all. They are intended as "despotic inroads on the rights of property . . . economically insufficient and provisional, but which . . . necessitate further inroads upon the old social order". They are an application of that grand objective of the proletariat, once it has become the ruling class, which the *Manifesto* proclaims: "to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e. of the proletariat organised as the ruling class." That is a very different state of affairs.

How much *capital* has the Labour Government wrested from the bourgeoisie? None. For every bankrupt or insufficiently active enterprise taken from a group of capitalists, e.g., the mineowners, the railway stockholders, Bank of England shareholders, etc.—they have been given a vested share in the national income as a whole. Is State-owned enterprise (the mines, the London docks) in the hands of the proletariat organised as the ruling class? Ask the miners and the dockers. What "inroads on the rights of property" has the Labour Government made? None whatsoever. British economy is still under capitalist control, the measures of the Labour Government are no more than State capitalism (there were State-owned railways in Tsarist Russia and there was a State Bank in Royal Prussia)—and the claims of the Labour leaders, therefore, just brazen effrontery.

Professor Laski follows his leaders loyally in this respect. When summarising the revolutionary part played by the bourgeoisie in history he suggests that the *Manifesto's* above-mentioned measures "will enable the workers to win the battle of democracy"—in other words, that they are to be applied *before* the workers have constituted themselves the ruling class—whereas the *Manifesto* says the exact opposite: that, once having won that battle, they should get on with their "despotic inroads"; just what the Labour Government hasn't done. He speculates on what Marx and Engels meant when they wrote in 1872 of the victorious proletariat "breaking" the machinery of the State (pp. 70-1), and concludes that it means giving the *existing* armed forces, the police and the civil service no special privileges—with never a hint that Marx dealt in detail with that very question in his *Eighteenth Brumaire*: and that it means that the present Home Office and Scotland Yard personnel can never serve anyone but the capitalist class, the present officers of the Army, Navy and R.A.F. ditto, and that the present higher grades of the Civil Service have been specially selected and trained to serve capitalism, not "the proletariat organised as the ruling class."

He has his own special discovery, however, as a result of studying the *Manifesto*. It is that, according to Marx and Engels, the Communists had no business to form a party of their own. He bases this discovery upon the well-known passage:

> "The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties. They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole. They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement."

Professor Laski positively skips with joy at this discovery. He quotes the passage no less than nine times (pp. 37, 40, 45, 48, 59, 64, 69, 78, 91): and —especially if the ludicrous excursions into the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (pp. 82-85) and the usual tirades against the Communist Parties elsewhere (pp. 86-90) be taken into account—Professor Laski leaves little doubt that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this is where the whole purpose of his *Introduction* is laid bare.

For the trouble is that three years' experience of the Labour Government is increasing the danger of Communism growing in Britain, of all countries. All hands to the pumps! Don't even mention in your *Introduction*, Harold, that Marx and Engels called their document *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (though an unkind printer puts those very words at the head of the text, on the page opposite your final peroration)! Keep your readers busy arguing that Marx and Engels didn't mean the dictatorship of the Communist Party when they wrote of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and assumed the latter would permit "vastly greater numbers to participate in social life effectively" than is possible under capitalism (p. 68)—as though Stalin had not long ago underlined the first point (*Leninism*, pp. 135-152), and as though the second had not long ago been demonstrated by daily practice in the Soviet Union (*vide* Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The Truth About Soviet Russia*)!

For if your readers really study the *Manifesto*, Professor Laski, they will find that it speaks of the Communists and "the other working-class parties", of their *aim and that* "of all the other proletarian parties": it shows the Communists *acting* as a distinctive party, *with* their distinctive internationalism, their distinctive *theoretical* insistence on "*the* interests of the movement as a whole", their distinctive tactics of bringing to the front the "property *question*" in whatever movement they support.

What then *did* Marx and Engels mean when they wrote the words which have so delighted Professor Laski? Obviously—for all, at least, but "the foremost English authority on the subject"—they meant that the Communists were not to be *sectarian*: they were not to oppose other working-class parties, but work with them (and there were only two such parties at the time, the Chartists in Britain and the Agrarian Reformers in America): they were to work with, and push on to action against the ruling classes, non-working class parties as well if they were in genuine opposition (several of them are listed in Part IV of the *Manifesto*): they were to help in "formation of the proletariat as a class". It was in pursuance of this policy that Marx and Engels, all their subsequent lives, did their utmost to get working-class parties formed on the principles embodied in the *Manifesto*.

Yet when, in 1879, there arose in the German Social-Democratic Party owing to the influx of non-working-class elements, a situation when "the people who came out as bourgeois democrats in 1848 could just as well call themselves Social-Democrats now", Marx and Engels sent a circular letter to the Party leaders threatening that, unless this were stopped, they would have publicly "to dissolve the solidarity with which we have hitherto represented the German party abroad" (Correspondence, pp. 374-7). And that is precisely what happened when nearly all the parties of the old Second International proved, by their attitude in the first world war, that they had abandoned Marxism altogether, tacitly accepting alliance with their own capitalists against revolutionary strains within the working-class of their country, and against the colonial peoples.

It is not surprising, by the way, that Professor Laski racks his brains (pp. 39, 77) to find explanations for the *use of the word "Communist" by the* authors of the *Manifesto*. They wanted to show that it was the work of the Communist League, he sagely guesses: or that they were different from the "true" Socialists of Germany: or possibly to do homage to the Paris Commune of 1792-4. "We have little other evidence on which to base speculations," he sums up with judicious care. Yet on pp. 115-6 we have Engels' direct testimony, in his preface to the German edition of 1890: "Socialism in 1847 signified a bourgeois movement, Communism a working-class movement. Socialism was, on the Continent at least, quite respectable, whereas Communism was the very opposite."

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

add: "Here are two postal subscriptions I sold for you. Don't allow me discount; I don't want it from the L.M." We mention this because for a bookseller to refuse his legitimate discount probably makes an all-time record in the trade.

WE ARE GENTLY REPROACHED.

It was splendid to get a gentle reproach from an old stalwart in the movement recently and her reminder that readers, as well as the *Labour Monthly*, are short of money. She wrote: "As you know, costs rise in rent (in the form of rates, which we used not to pay separately in flats) and in almost every item, for us, the readers, as well as for the *Labour Monthly*. This state of things prevents one from giving as much to the many things one wishes to help as one would like to give. However, herewith is a cheque for £2. It is a donation for once only. I cannot promise it monthly, or even yearly." Her gentle reproach was backed, you see, with a generous gift—a sure way of making the criticism stick in our memory. We know what she says is true, because OUR rates have gone up, OUR insurance contributions, OUR paper costs, OUR travelling expenses are climbing steeply. We agree with her, that the cost of living for our old "regulars" is rising too. That's why we ask more readers to help out. This month's figures show that the trend was beginning in June, when we received

£40 2s. 7d.

Regular donations came from:

W. F. Lakin Smith, 2s. 6d; S. Mill, £1; L. Rowan, 6s; F. Wedlake, 2s. 6d; R.F.B., £3; L'Humanité, 3s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; Anon., Whitchurch, 1s; Royston Green, 3s. 6d; T. Flood, 2s. 6d; G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert, 10s; Olivia Greene, £2; S. Morrissey, 10s; D. H. Strathern and friends, 15s; P. J. Davis, 2s; R. McLeod, 5s; Cambridge Branch C.P., 10s; D. Rees, 10s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; Socialist Sailor, £1; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d; Director, £2.

Other contributions include:

R. Stubbs, 1s; J. McLanachan, 8s; W. Dickson, 3s; E. Whitworth, 8s; Mrs. A. Singer, £2; W. E. Paxman, 8s; D. Goodfellow, 5s. 6d; J. Walter, 8s; P. J. Wallis, 8s; J. Fraser, 8s; M. E. Bardsley, 3s; T. Graham, 8s; C. G. Taff, 8s; Mrs. I. M. Crossley, 8s; A. P. Reed, 2s; T. Powell (jr.), 3s; A. Idle, 8s; D. R. Morgan, 8s; J. B. Hodgson, 9s; D. F. M. Parvin, 8s; D. E. Thomson, 3s; W. G. Pendrill, 18s; M. Griffiths, 2s; P. Sloan, 9s; J. A. Stephen, 3s; L. Newmark, 8s; Stanley Walker, 3s; W. Harry Parke, £10; Mrs. E. Muskett, £1 8s; A. S. Levan, 5s; R. C. Abbatt, 8s; F. R. Padbury, 3s; M. G. Balchin, 8s; J. M. Burnett, 8s; A. E. Portbury, 18s; Stan Dean, 3s; R. C. (U.S.A.), 9s. 8d; L.B.D. (U.S.A.), 9s. 11d.

For this relief, much thanks. ANGELA TUCKETT.

"BRITAIN'S PREMIER SPORTS PRINTERS"

Members of British Federation of Master Printers.
Members of British Association of Sports Printers.

Are you prepared for the opening of the Football Season? We are! Let us assist you in raising your Club Funds by the means of our FOOTBALL DOUBLES & TREBLES COMPETITION CARDS.

Samples forwarded on request.

CAMBRIDGE PRESS
Clayton-le-Moors, Nr. ACCRINGTON, Lancs.
Tel. No. 2054 Accrington.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRUSH UP YOUR CHINESE

Turn to the other side of the world—to China. Here is a letter from a student correspondent. This young woman has just returned from China, where she was the guest of the National Student Federation of China—the banned organisation of the students.

> *"The students in China over the past two years have shown by their heroism that they will ever remain the staunch allies of all the Chinese peasants and workers. Many of them lie dead in the battlefields. The Chinese students wish to receive literature from this country telling them of our lives and activities. Books and magazines would immediately find pride of place in the numerous student libraries in all the Universities. I would appeal through you to your readers to offer subscriptions for Labour Monthly to these student groups, or at least to send their copies when they have finished with them."*

Knowing how readers responded to appeals from Germany, I had no hesitation in promising her in advance that the same help would be forthcoming, and that readers would be eager to prove to China that not all the British are cut from the same reactionary cloth.

How pleasant it is to establish these fraternal links with friends abroad! Many British readers have written thanking us for giving them the chance. And not only British. An Irishman who is now writing to readers both in Germany and the U.S. remarked how much he appreciated "the part you are playing in organising this correspondence and creating contacts." (And our postman adds: "Please can I have the stamps for my youngster's collection?")

PENNY PLAIN, TUPPENCE COLOURED

It is interesting to see how national characteristics come out in the letters we get here. The Germans stress how valuable the *Labour Monthly* is to them in their work. That phrase comes up in every letter. The Americans can be relied upon for frank superlatives . . . "always the best key in English to an understanding of the world's problems" (A University professor); ". . . I've said it before, but I can't help saying it again—it's the best periodical of its kind" (California); ". . . there's no magazine published here or elsewhere that I consider so meaty and enlightening" (Virginia); ". . . considerably superior to anything comparable here" (Los Angeles); ". . . Full of meat and distinguished writing" (Chicago); "I am an old admirer. There is no periodical which I read with greater pleasure and profit—and by 'no periodical' I mean exactly that." (Another professor). In contrast to these warm colours the British readers are plain and austere. Characteristic are: "Enclosed please find my monthly usual. A good number"; or "Here's my sub. Keep the change". Ex-servicemen, however, often run to praise—perhaps because they remember what it meant to miss it in the past. L.B. (Oldham) writes: "Here's 5s to the fund which I shall repeat as oft as I can, because peace or war, in khaki or out, we cannot do or go without it." So much for the dull uniformity of socialism, which wipes out all individual and national characteristics, according to the great minds of the bourgeois propagandists!

A NEW DISCUSSION GROUP

Any reader in the Willesden area who would like to be put in touch with someone who is organising a *Labour Monthly* Discussion Group there should write to me at 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

THE SURPRISING BOOKSELLER

We have just heard from a Canadian bookseller who, after saying that "Strings or Chains?" was just what's wanted. Good on you!" goes on to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED